Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009

Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 148559
ORIGIN ACDA-03

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 EUR-03 /007 R

66011
DRAFTED BY: ACDA/ISP/REG:LFISCHER:CF
APPROVED BY: ACDA/ISP/REG:LFISCHER
----------084284 250511Z /14
P 250031Z JUN 77
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO AMEMBASSY MOSCOW PRIORITY

S E C R E T STATE 148559

FOLLOWING TEL SENT ACTION SECSTATE, SECDEF WASHDC INFO NATO,
BONN, LONDON, USNMR SHAPE, USCINCEUR FROM MBFR VIENNA JUNE 22:

QUOTE S E C R E T MBFR VIENNA 330

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: PARM, NATO
SUBJECT: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: DATA DISAGGREGATION

REF: A) USNATO 4794 DTG 061059Z JUN 77
B) BONN 9444 DTG 031707Z JUN 77
C) MBFR VIENNA 219 DTG 122015Z MAY 77
D) USNATO 5539 DTG 171553Z JUN 77
E) USNATO 5759 DTG 211717Z JUN 77

THIS MESSAGE TRANSMITS A SUGGESTED TEXT OF DRAFT GUIDANCE FOR
AHG FOR POSSIBLE BACKGROUND USE BY WASHINGTON AGENCIES IN CONNECTION
WITH PENDING SPC DISCUSSIONS OF DRAFT GUIDANCE ON DATA DISAGGREGA-
TION PROPOSAL. BRACKETED LANGUAGE CORRESPONDING TO PRESUMED FRG
SECRET

PAGE 02 STATE 148559

VIEWS (E.G. ON NATIONAL DESIGNATIONS OF RESIDUAL PERSONNEL) HAS
BEEN INCLUDED IN THE TEXT. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON CERTAIN ASPECTS
OF THE FRG PROPOSAL ARE PROVIDED AT THE END OF THE MESSAGE.

BEGIN TEXT OF DRAFT NAC GUIDANCE TO AHG ON DATA DISAGGREGATION:

1. IN RESPONSE TO THE EASTERN PROPOSAL TO TABLE SEPARATE MAN-
POWER TOTALS FOR EACH OF THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN THE REDUCTION ARE
A
AND AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE WESTERN PROPOSAL TO TABLE FIGURES FOR

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009

US AND SOVIET MILITARY MANPOWER IN THE AREA, WESTERN NEGOTIATORS ARE AUTHORIZED TO PROPOSE THE FOLLOWING CONCEPT TO THE EAST AS THE NEXT STEP IN THE DATA DISCUSSION.

2. GROUND FORCES: EACH SIDE SHOULD SIMULTANEOUSLY TABLE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION FOR ITS GROUND FORCES IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS:

A. MAJOR GROUND FORCE UNITS

1. THE OFFICIAL DESIGNATION, INCLUDING NATIONALITY, AND THE ACTUAL NUMERICAL STRENGTH AS OF 1 JANUARY 1976 FOR EACH GROUND FORCE ARMY OR EQUIVALENT PEACETIME LEVEL OF COMMAND IN THE FORCES OF THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS. (SEE FOOTNOTE 1).

BEGIN BRACKETS: 2. THE OFFICIAL DESIGNATION AND ACTUAL NUMERICAL STRENGTH AS OF JANUARY 1, 1976 FOR EACH GROUND FORCE DIVISION IN THE FORCES OF THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS. END BRACKETS.

B. GROUND FORCE PERSONNEL NOT IN MAJOR UNITS

1. FOR EACH DIRECT PARTICIPANT, THE ACTUAL TOTAL NUMBER AS OF

SECRET

PAGE 03 STATE 148559

1 JANUARY 1976 OF ITS ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL IN THE AREA NOT ORGANIZED IN THE MAJOR UNITS LISTED UNDER A.1 ABOVE.

BEGIN BRACKETS: 1. THE TOTAL NUMBER AS OF 1 JANUARY 1976 OF ALL ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL OF THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN THE MAJOR UNITS LISTED UNDER A.1 AND 2 ABOVE. END BRACKETS.

C. GROUND FORCE DIVISIONS

1. WESTERN NEGOTIATORS MAY AT THEIR DISCRETION SUGGEST TO THE EAST THAT EACH SIDE SHOULD, AS A NEXT STEP IN THE DATA DISCUSSION, PROVIDE INFORMATION ON INDIVIDUAL GROUND FORCE DIVISIONS IN THE FORCES OF THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN THE AREA CORRESPONDING TO THAT PROVIDED FOR ARMIES AND CORPS.

3. AIR FORCE: WESTERN NEGOTIATORS SHOULD TELL THE EAST THAT THEY WOULD BE WILLING TO PROVIDE THE FIGURES ON THE AIR FORCES OF THE WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WHICH WOULD CORRESPOND TO THE FIGURES PROVIDED FOR THE GROUND FORCES, ONCE EACH SIDE HAS PUT FORWARD ITS FIGURES FOR THE GROUND FORCE FORMATIONS AND UNITS LISTED IN PARA 2 AND HAS HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS THOSE PUT FORWARD BY THE OTHER SIDE.IF BEFORE GIVING A FINAL ANSWER, THE EAST ASKS WHAT TYPE OF INFORMATION ON AIR FORCES WOULD CORRESPOND TO THE GROUND FORCE FORMATIONS LISTED IN PARA 2, WESTERN NEGOTIATORS MAY OUTLINE THE CONCEPTS CONTAINED IN PARAS A AND B BELOW. IN THE EVENT THAT THE EAST INSISTS THAT FIGURES FOR BOTH GROUND AND AIR FORCES SHOULD BE PUT FORWARD SIMULTANEOUSLY AND STATES THAT IT WILL NOT OTHERWISE

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009

BE WILLING TO EXCHANGE DISAGGREGATED DATA ON GROUND FORCES AND, IN THE JUDGEMENT OF THE AHG, IT WILL NOT BE POSSIBLE TO OBTAIN EASTERN AGREEMENT TO A DATA DISAGGREGATION ALONG THE LINES PROPOSED BY THE WEST IF THIS WESTERN CONDITION IS INSISTED ON, THEN WESTERN NEGOTIATORS MAY STATE THAT THEY ARE PREPARED TO TABLE BOTH SETS OF FIGURES SIMULTANEOUSLY.

BEGIN BRACKETS: WESTERN NEGOTIATORS MAY TELL THE EAST THAT THEY WOULD IN DUE COURSE BE WILLING TO PROVIDE FIGURES ON THE
SECRET

PAGE 04 STATE 148559

AIR FORCES OF THE WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WHICH WOULD CORRESPOND TO THE FIGURES PROVIDED FOR THE GROUND FORCES, BUT ONLY WHEN THE DISCUSSION OF THE GROUND FORCE FIGURES LISTED UNDER A HAS BEEN CONCLUDED. END BRACKETS.

ONCE THE CONDITIONS FOR THE EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION ON AIR FORCE MANPOWER HAVE BEEN AGREED, WESTERN NEGOTIATORS SHOULD PROPOSE THAT EACH SIDE SHOULD SIMULTANEOUSLY TABLE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION FOR ITS AIR FORCES IN THE AREA.

A. MAJOR AIR FORCE UNITS

1. THE OFFICIAL DESIGNATION, INCLUDING NATIONALITY, AND THE ACUTUAL NUMERICAL STRENGTH AS OF 1 JANUARY 1976 FOR EACH AIR FORCE OPERATIONAL COMMAND IN THE FORCES OF THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS. (SEE FOOTNOTE 2).

B. AIR FORCE PERSONNEL NOT IN MAJOR UNITS

1. FOR EACH DIRECT PARTICIPANT, THE ACTUAL TOTAL NUMBER AS OF 1 JANUARY 1976 OF ALL ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL IN THE AREA NOT ORGANIZED IN THE AIR FORCE OPERATIONAL COMMANDS LISTED UNDER A.1 ABOVE.

BEGIN BRACKETS: 1. THE ACTUAL TOTAL NUMBER AS OF 1 JANUARY 1976 OF ALL ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL OF THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN THE AREA NOT ORGANIZED IN THE AIR FORCE OPERATIONAL COMMANDS LISTED UNDER A.1 ABOVE. END BRACKETS.

4. IN MAKING THIS PROPOSAL TO THE EAST, WESTERN NEGOTIATORS SHOULD STATE THAT:

A. THE PURPOSE OF THE DATA DISCUSSION IN ITS PRESENT STAGE IS
SECRET

PAGE 05 STATE 148559

TO CLARIFY THE EXISTING DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN EASTERN AND WESTERN FIGURES.

B. ACCORDINGLY, ANY BREAKDOWN OF THE GLOBAL FIGURES TABLED BY

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009

EACH SIDE HAS THE SOLE PURPOSE OF HELPING TO CLARIFY THESE DISCREPANCIES.

5. (DISCLAIMERS AS GIVEN IN IS DRAFT GUIDANCE, REF D).

F O O T N O T E S:
(1) THE TERM "EQUIVALENT PEACETIME LEVELS OF COMMAND" IS DESIGNED TO COVER THOSE ORGANIZATIONS OF MILITARY FORCES WHICH IN THEIR PEACETIME STATUS ARE NOT CALLED ARMIES OR CORPS, BUT WHOSE HEADQUARTERS AND COMPONENT ELEMENTS CONSTITUTE THE FORCES WHICH BECOME ARMIES IN WARTIME. FYI FOR EXAMPLE, THE HEADQUARTERS OF THE MILITARY DISTRICTS OF THE GDR, POLISH, AND CSSR AND THE TROOPS SUBORDINATED TO THEM WOULD BE CONSIDERED THE "EQUIVALENT PEACETIME LEVEL OF COMMAND" TO ANY ARMY. (SEE P. 23, 24, 27, 28, 30 AND 36 OF MCM-86/76). END FYI.

(2) AIR FORCE OPERATIONAL COMMANDS SHOULD BE DEFINED AS REFERRING TO SUCH ORGANIZATIONS AS TACTICAL AIR COMMANDS, EASTERN AIR ARMIES, OR THE EQUIVALENT. END TEXT OF DRAFT GUIDANCE.

END OF FOOTNOTE.

6. COMMENT: ALTHOUGH THE MODALITIES OF THE FRG APPROACH ARE NOT ENTIRELY CLEAR, THE FRG APPEARS TO ENVISAGE GUIDANCE FOR THE AHG WHICH WOULD INCLUDE NOT ONLY A DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL ITSELF, BUT ALSO INTERNAL GUIDANCE FOR THE AHG INCORPORATING THE PRINCIPLES OF THE DATA DISCUSSION AND ARGUMENTS FOR USE WITH THE EAST SET FORTH IN SECTIONS II AND III OF THE FRG PAPER. (REF A).

7. IN OUR VIEW, IT WOULD BE PREFERABLE TO LIMIT THE GUIDANCE TO A DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL TO BE PUT FORTH TO THE EAST. EFFORTS TO REACH AN AGREED ALLIED POSITION ON PRINCIPLES OF THE DATA DISCUSSION

ARE BOUND AT BEST TO PROLONG AN ALREADY LENGTHY DISCUSSION, GIVEN THE UNDERLYING LACK OF AGREEMENT ON THE FRG APPROACH. IN ADDITION, REQUIRING EASTERN AGREEMENT TO CERTAIN PRINCIPLES FOR A DATA DISCUSSION WOULD ADD TO THE ALREADY CONSIDERABLE DIFFICULTY OF OBTAINING EASTERN ACCEPTANCE OF THE WESTERN PROPOSAL AS A WHOLE.

8. MORE IMPORTANT, THE FRG PROPOSALS ON WHAT SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE GUIDANCE PRESENT SERIOUS SUBSTANTIVE PROBLEMS. IF ADOPTED, THEY WOULD IN EFFECT PROHIBIT WESTERN NEGOTIATORS FROM REFERRING TO NATIONAL TOTALS IN ANY WAY IN THE DATA DISCUSSION AND FROM CONFIRMING THE ACCURACY OF NATIONAL TOTALS WHICH THE EAST MIGHT DERIVE FROM FIGURES TABLED BY THE WEST. THE WEST WOULD ALSO BE REQUIRED TO TELL THE EAST THAT NATIONAL TOTALS WERE IRRELEVANT TO AN EFFORT TO LOCATE THE SOURCES OF THE DISCREPANCY.

9. A WESTERN POSITION WHICH DOES NOT ALLOW WESTERN NEGOTIATORS TO CONFIRM THE ACCURACY OF THE SUM OF THE FIGURES THEY HAVE TABLED IS NOT A TENABLE ONE. THE ONLY PLAUSIBLE REASON THEY COULD GIVE FOR NOT

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009

DOING SO WOULD BE THAT THEY WERE CONCERNED THAT NATIONAL TOTALS MIGHT PREJUDICE THE ALLIED POSITION ON NATIONAL CEILINGS, THEREBY MAKING A DIRECT CONNECTION BETWEEN THE OVERALL NEGOTIATING POSITION OF EACH SIDE AND THE DATA DISCUSSION.

10. MOREOVER, A WESTERN STATEMENT THAT NATIONAL TOTALS WERE IRRELEVANT TO AN EFFORT TO LOCATE THE SOURCES OF THE DISCREPANCY WOULD NOT BE CREDIBLE. FOR ONE THING WESTERN NEGOTIATORS THEMSELVES WOULD WANT TO OBTAIN EASTERN NATIONAL TOTALS, EITHER DIRECTLY OR THROUGH COMPUTATION, AS THE BASIS FOR FURTHER PROBING AND CHALLENGE TO EASTERN FIGURES. SECONDLY, NATIONAL TOTALS ARE THE SET OF DISAGGREGATED FIGURES BELOW THE LEVEL OF AGGREGATE EASTERN GROUND AND AIR MANPOWER WHICH ARE LEAST SUBJECT TO UNCERTAINTIES OF ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND UNIT SUBORDINATION. DISCREPANCIES IN FIGURES FOR MANPOWER IN ARMIES, FOR EXAMPLE, COULD BE ATTRIBUTABLE

SECRET

PAGE 07 STATE 148559

TO DIFFERENCES IN WHAT EACH SIDE HAS COUNTED IN A GIVEN FORMATION. SUCH DISCREPANCIES COULD EXIST EVEN WHERE THERE WERE NO DISCREPANCIES IN NATIONAL TOTALS. IN FACT, IF THERE WERE NO DISCREPANCIES IN THE NATIONAL TOTALS FOR A SPECIFIC COUNTRY, THERE WOULD BE NO CREDIBLE BASIS FOR CHALLENGING EASTERN FIGURES FOR THAT COUNTRY WHATEVER THE DISCREPANCIES IN THE FIGURES FOR ITS ARMIES AND REAR ECHELON COMPONENTS. IN PURELY PRACTICAL TERMS, THEREFORE, IDENTIFICATION OF DISCREPANCIES IN NATIONAL TOTALS AND THE DETERMINATION OF THE MAGNITUDE OF DISCREPANCY FOR EACH SET OF NATIONAL FIGURES REPRESENTS A NECESSARY STEP IN SEARCHING FOR SOURCES OF THE DISCREPANCY IN OVERALL TOTALS.

11. THESE RESTRICTIONS WOULD TOTALLY DEPRIVE ALLIED NEGOTIATORS OF THE MOST IMPORTANT ARGUMENT FOR GAINING EASTERN ACCEPTANCE TO THE WESTERN PROPOSAL. THE PRINCIPAL ARGUMENT THAT CAN BE MADE IN FAVOR OF A FRG UNIT DISAGGREGATION APPROACH IS THAT IT WOULD GO ONE STEP BEYOND NATIONAL TOTALS TO A FURTHER STAGE OF DISAGGREGATION AND THUS WOULD MOVE FURTHER TOWARDS CLARIFICATION OF THE DISCREPANCIES. IT SHOULD NOT BE PRESENTED AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO NATIONAL TOTALS BUT AS THE NEXT STEP BEYOND IT. WE MUST BE IN A POSITION TO DEPRIVE THE EAST OF ANY ABILITY TO DEFEND AGAINST ACCEPTING THE WESTERN PROPOSAL ON THE GROUNDS THAT IT WILL NOT PROVIDE THE EAST THE INFORMATION WHICH IT HAS OFFERED TO TABLE.

12. AS REGARDS THE DISCLAIMERS, PROPOSED IS GUIDANCE (REF D) SEEMS TO US SATISFACTORY SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM. FOR REASONS OUTLINED IN MBFR 305, WE FULLY AGREE WITH USNATO'S JUDGMENT THAT GUIDANCE SHOULD NOT AUTHORIZE USE OF THE INTERNAL ALLIED POSITION ON PHASE II REDUCTION COMMITMENT BY THE AHG (REF E, PARA 11). END COMMENT. RESOR UNQUOTE VANCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 22-Sep-1999 12:00:00 am
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: DATA, NEGOTIATIONS, BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS, FORCE & TROOP LEVELS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Sent Date: 25-Jun-1977 12:00:00 am
Decaption Date: 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 22 May 2009
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1977STATE148559
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: ACDA/ISP/REG:LFISCHER:CF
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Expiration:
Film Number: D770227-0992
Format: TEL
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1977/newtext/t197706110/baaaetct.tel
Line Count: 269
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, TEXT ON MICROFILM
Message ID: 891f9e73-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ORIGIN ACDA
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A) USNATO 4794 DTG 061059Z JUN 77 B) BONN 9444 DTG 031707Z JUN 77 C) MBFR VIENNA 219 DTG 122015Z MAY 77 D) USNATO 5539 DTG 171553Z JUN 77 E) USNATO 5759 DTG 211717Z JUN 77
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 28-Oct-2004 12:00:00 am
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 2013259
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: DATA DISAGGREGATION
TAGS: PARM, UR, US, NATO
To: MOSCOW
Type: TE
vdkvgwkey: odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/891f9e73-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
22 May 2009
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009